

REMARKS

In an Office Action mailed on January 30, 2006, claims 1-31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Peyer in view of Doyle. Applicant submits that a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been set forth for any of the § 103 rejections for at least the following reasons.

In order to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness based on a combination of references, the Examiner must show that one skilled in the art, *without knowledge of the claimed invention*, would have combined references to derive the claimed invention. M.P.E.P. § 2143. The Examiner concedes that Peyer fails to teach or suggest a browser that is adapted to establish a browser interface that has a user interface to display a presentation of multimedia data, where this user interface also loads a markup language file that is associated with a script handler. Office Action, 3. Therefore the Examiner relies on Doyle to allegedly supply the missing claim limitations.

Applicant submits that a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established for at least the reason that the Examiner fails to show where Doyle allegedly teaches or suggests a user interface to display presentation of multimedia data. Therefore, Applicant requests specific citations, rather than a citation to Doyle's Summary section. Additionally, a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been set forth for any of the claims for at least the reason that the cited prior art fails to contain a suggestion or motivation to modify Peyer to derive the claimed invention. In other words, the Examiner fails to show where the prior art contains the alleged suggestion or motivation to modify Peyer so that a browser instance that has a user interface to display presentation of multimedia data also loads a markup language file that is associated with a script handler. Without this showing, a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established.

Thus, the Examiner fails to show where the prior art allegedly teaches or suggests a browser that is adapted to establish a browser instance that has a user interface to display a presentation of multimedia data and a markup language file that is associated with a script handler and is located by the browser instance. As such, for at least this reason, a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established for independent claim 1.

Regarding independent claim 10, the Examiner fails to show where the prior art allegedly teaches or suggests a browser that is adapted to establish a browser instance that has a user interface to display presentation of audio/video data and a file that is associated with the

predetermined instructions and is loadable by the browser instance. Therefore, for at least this reason, a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established for independent claim 10.

Regarding independent claim 12, a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established for this claim for at least the reason that the Examiner fails to show where the prior art allegedly teaches or suggests invoking a script handler to create a user interface and in a browser instance and displaying information associated with multimedia data with the user interface in a browser instance. Thus, a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established for independent claim 12.

Likewise, a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established for independent claim 16, in that the prior art fails to teach or suggest loading a file into a browser instance and creating an interface in the browser instance based on instructions associated with the file. Thus, a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been set forth for independent claim 16.


Dependent claims 2-9, 11, 13-15 and 17-19 are patentable for at least the reason that these claims depend from an allowable claim.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, withdrawal of the § 103 rejections and a favorable action in the form of a Notice of Allowance are requested. The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 20-1504 (ITL.0215US).

Date: May 1, 2006

Respectfully submitted,



Fred G. Pruner, Jr., Reg. No. 40,779
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.
8554 Katy Freeway, Suite 100
Houston, Texas 77024
(713) 468-8880 [Phone]
(713) 468-8883 [Fax]

Attorney for Intel Corporation